

That is in the Seventh Congressional District.

Then, as Fred decided to go to law school and came back to Nashville, he settled in Williamson County, right there in Franklin and Brentwood in suburban Nashville. And that is where I got to know the Thompson family.

□ 1530

I know this is a very exciting day for them, to know that this is actually taking place, that the House is completing their work and we are sending this on to the Senate for Senators CORKER and ALEXANDER to do their part of the work on this building.

Many people did know Fred Thompson as an actor, and one of the things you would hear people talk about is Fred was a “character actor.” But that unassuming manner, the way he valued and embodied integrity, that was just Fred. That was how he lived his life, and he was a great “character actor” because he really played himself.

Whether it was “Marie,” whether it was the “Hunt for Red October,” whether you were watching him on the small screen or the big screen, he was exactly who he appeared to be, very unassuming, very dedicated, very smart, and a wonderful attorney.

Of course, his public service did start as an Assistant U.S. Attorney in Nashville in the old Federal courthouse, and that did grow. The Watergate Committee, as Congressman COHEN has mentioned, was where Fred really made a mark and where he became extremely close to Senator Howard Baker, who was such a role model for so many generations of Tennesseans and Americans. How exciting it would be for Senator Baker to be here to know Fred’s name was going to be on that courthouse in Nashville.

This is the right move for the right person. I encourage all of my colleagues to join in passage of this legislation.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, given Senator Thompson’s dedication to the law and public service, I believe it is more than fitting to name this courthouse and Federal building in Nashville after him.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 6135.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, November 29, 2016.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,  
Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on November 29, 2016, at 1:48 p.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 2873.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

#### JUSTICE FOR ALL REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2016

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2577) to protect crime victims’ rights, to eliminate the substantial backlog of DNA and other forensic evidence samples to improve and expand the forensic science testing capacity of Federal, State, and local crime laboratories, to increase research and development of new testing technologies, to develop new training programs regarding the collection and use of forensic evidence, to provide post-conviction testing of DNA evidence to exonerate the innocent, to support accreditation efforts of forensic science laboratories and medical examiner offices, to address training and equipment needs, to improve the performance of counsel in State capital cases, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 2577

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Justice for All Reauthorization Act of 2016”.

#### SEC. 2. CRIME VICTIMS’ RIGHTS.

(a) **RESTITUTION DURING SUPERVISED RELEASE.**—Section 3583(d) of title 18, United States Code, is amended in the first sentence by inserting “, that the defendant make restitution in accordance with sections 3663 and 3663A, or any other statute authorizing a sentence of restitution,” after “supervision”.

(b) **COLLECTION OF RESTITUTION FROM DEFENDANT’S ESTATE.**—Section 3613(b) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following: “The liability to pay restitution shall terminate on the date that is the later of 20 years from the entry of judgment or 20 years after the release from imprisonment of the person ordered to pay restitution. In the event of the death of the person ordered to pay restitution, the individual’s estate will be held responsible for any unpaid balance of the restitution amount, and the lien provided in subsection (c) of this section shall continue until the estate receives a written release of that liability.”.

(c) **VICTIM INTERPRETERS.**—Rule 28 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure is amended in the first sentence by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, including an interpreter for the victim”.

(d) **GAO STUDY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall—

(A) conduct a study to determine whether enhancing the restitution provisions under sections 3663 and 3663A of title 18, United States Code, to provide courts broader authority to award restitution for Federal offenses would be beneficial to crime victims and what other factors Congress should consider in weighing such changes; and

(B) submit to Congress a report on the study conducted under subparagraph (A).

(2) **CONTENTS.**—In conducting the study under paragraph (1), the Comptroller General shall focus on the benefits to crime victims that would result if the restitution provisions under sections 3663 and 3663A of title 18, United States Code, were expanded—

(A) to apply to victims who have suffered harm, injury, or loss that would not have occurred but for the defendant’s related conduct;

(B) in the case of an offense resulting in bodily injury resulting in the victim’s death, to allow the court to use its discretion to award an appropriate sum to reflect the income lost by the victim’s surviving family members or estate as a result of the victim’s death;

(C) to require that the defendant pay to the victim an amount determined by the court to restore the victim to the position he or she would have been in had the defendant not committed the offense; and

(D) to require that the defendant compensate the victim for any injury, harm, or loss, including emotional distress, that occurred as a result of the offense.

#### SEC. 3. REDUCING THE RAPE KIT BACKLOG.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Of the amounts made available to the Attorney General for a DNA Analysis and capacity enhancement program and for other local, State, and Federal forensic activities under the heading “STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT” under the heading “OFFICE OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS” under the heading “DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE” in fiscal years 2018, 2019, 2020, and 2021—

(1) not less than 75 percent of such amounts shall be provided for grants for activities described under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 2(a) of the DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 14135(a)); and

(2) not less than 5 percent of such amounts shall be provided for grants for law enforcement agencies to conduct audits of their backlogged rape kits under section 2(a)(7) of the DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 14135(a)(7)) to create and operate associated tracking systems and to prioritize testing in those cases in which the statute of limitation will soon expire.

(b) **REPORTING.**—

(1) **REPORT BY GRANT RECIPIENTS.**—With respect to amounts made available to the Attorney General for a DNA Analysis and capacity enhancement program and for other local, State, and Federal forensic activities under the heading “STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT” under the heading “OFFICE OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS” under the heading “DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE”, the Attorney General shall require recipients of the amounts to report on the effectiveness of the activities carried out using the amounts, including any information the Attorney General needs in order to submit the report required under paragraph (2).

(2) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 1 month after the last day of each even-numbered fiscal year, the Attorney General shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report that includes, for each recipient of amounts described in paragraph (1)—

(A) the amounts distributed to the recipient;

(B) a summary of the purposes for which the amounts were used and an evaluation of the progress of the recipient in achieving those purposes;

(C) a statistical summary of the crime scene samples and arrestee or offender samples submitted to laboratories, the average time between the submission of a sample to a laboratory and the testing of the sample, and the percentage of the amounts that were paid to private laboratories; and

(D) an evaluation of the effectiveness of the grant amounts in increasing capacity and reducing backlogs.

#### SEC. 4. SEXUAL ASSAULT NURSE EXAMINERS.

Section 304 of the DNA Sexual Assault Justice Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 14136a) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

“(c) PREFERENCE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In reviewing applications submitted in accordance with a program authorized, in whole or in part, by this section, the Attorney General shall give preference to any eligible entity that certifies that the entity will use the grant funds to—

“(A) improve forensic nurse examiner programs in a rural area or for an underserved population, as those terms are defined in section 4002 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13925);

“(B) engage in activities that will assist in the employment of full-time forensic nurse examiners to conduct activities under subsection (a); or

“(C) sustain or establish a training program for forensic nurse examiners.

“(2) DIRECTIVE TO THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.—Not later than the beginning of fiscal year 2018, the Attorney General shall coordinate with the Secretary of Health and Human Services to inform Federally Qualified Health Centers, Community Health Centers, hospitals, colleges and universities, and other appropriate health-related entities about the role of forensic nurses and existing resources available within the Department of Justice and the Department of Health and Human Services to train or employ forensic nurses to address the needs of communities dealing with sexual assault, domestic violence, and elder abuse. The Attorney General shall collaborate on this effort with non-governmental organizations representing forensic nurses.”

#### SEC. 5. PROTECTING THE VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT.

Section 8(e)(1)(A) of the Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003 (42 U.S.C. 15607(e)(1)(A)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in clause (ii), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by inserting at the end the following:

“(iii) the program is not administered by the Office on Violence Against Women of the Department of Justice.”

#### SEC. 6. CLARIFICATION OF VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT HOUSING PROTECTIONS.

Section 41411(b)(3)(B)(ii) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14043e-11(b)(3)(B)(ii)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by inserting “or resident” after “any remaining tenant”; and

(2) in the second sentence, by inserting “or resident” after “tenant” each place it appears.

#### SEC. 7. STRENGTHENING THE PRISON RAPE ELIMINATION ACT.

The Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003 (42 U.S.C. 15601 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 6(d)(2) (42 U.S.C. 15605(d)(2)), by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

“(A)(i) include the certification of the chief executive that the State receiving such grant has adopted all national prison rape standards that, as of the date on which the application was submitted, have been promulgated under this Act; or

“(ii) demonstrate to the Attorney General, in such manner as the Attorney General shall require, that the State receiving such grant is actively working to adopt and achieve full compliance with the national prison rape standards described in clause (i);”;

(2) in section 8(e) (42 U.S.C. 15607(e))—

(A) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) ADOPTION OF NATIONAL STANDARDS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For each fiscal year, any amount that a State would otherwise receive for prison purposes for that fiscal year under a grant program covered by this subsection shall be reduced by 5 percent, unless the chief executive officer of the State submits to the Attorney General proof of compliance with this Act through—

“(i) a certification that the State has adopted, and is in full compliance with, the national standards described in subsection (a); or

“(ii) an assurance that the State intends to adopt and achieve full compliance with those national standards so as to ensure that a certification under clause (i) may be submitted in future years, which includes—

“(I) a commitment that not less than 5 percent of such amount shall be used for this purpose; or

“(II) a request that the Attorney General hold 5 percent of such amount in abeyance pursuant to the requirements of subparagraph (E).

“(B) RULES FOR CERTIFICATION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—A chief executive officer of a State who submits a certification under this paragraph shall also provide the Attorney General with—

“(I) a list of the prisons under the operational control of the executive branch of the State;

“(II) a list of the prisons listed under subclause (I) that were audited during the most recently concluded audit year;

“(III) all final audit reports for prisons listed under subclause (I) that were completed during the most recently concluded audit year; and

“(IV) a proposed schedule for completing an audit of all the prisons listed under subclause (I) during the following 3 audit years.

“(ii) AUDIT APPEAL EXCEPTION.—Beginning on the date that is 3 years after the date of enactment of the Justice for All Reauthorization Act of 2016, a chief executive officer of a State may submit a certification that the State is in full compliance pursuant to subparagraph (A)(i) even if a prison under the operational control of the executive branch of the State has an audit appeal pending.

“(C) RULES FOR ASSURANCES.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—A chief executive officer of a State who submits an assurance under subparagraph (A)(ii) shall also provide the Attorney General with—

“(I) a list of the prisons under the operational control of the executive branch of the State;

“(II) a list of the prisons listed under subclause (I) that were audited during the most recently concluded audit year;

“(III) an explanation of any barriers the State faces to completing required audits;

“(IV) all final audit reports for prisons listed under subclause (I) that were completed

during the most recently concluded audit year;

“(V) a proposed schedule for completing an audit of all prisons under the operational control of the executive branch of the State during the following 3 audit years; and

“(VI) an explanation of the State’s current degree of implementation of the national standards.

“(ii) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENT.—A chief executive officer of a State who submits an assurance under subparagraph (A)(ii)(I) shall, before receiving the applicable funds described in subparagraph (A)(ii)(I), also provide the Attorney General with a proposed plan for the expenditure of the funds during the applicable grant period.

“(iii) ACCOUNTING OF FUNDS.—A chief executive officer of a State who submits an assurance under subparagraph (A)(ii)(I) shall, in a manner consistent with the applicable grant reporting requirements, submit to the Attorney General a detailed accounting of how the funds described in subparagraph (A) were used.

“(D) SUNSET OF ASSURANCE OPTION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—On the date that is 3 years after the date of enactment of the Justice for All Reauthorization Act of 2016, subclause (II) of subparagraph (A)(ii) shall cease to have effect.

“(ii) ADDITIONAL SUNSET.—On the date that is 6 years after the date of enactment of the Justice for All Reauthorization Act of 2016, clause (ii) of subparagraph (A) shall cease to have effect.

“(iii) EMERGENCY ASSURANCES.—

“(I) REQUEST.—Notwithstanding clause (ii), during the 2-year period beginning 6 years after the date of enactment of the Justice for All Reauthorization Act of 2016, a chief executive officer of a State who certifies that the State has audited not less than 90 percent of prisons under the operational control of the executive branch of the State may request that the Attorney General allow the chief executive officer to submit an emergency assurance in accordance with subparagraph (A)(ii) as in effect on the day before the date on which that subparagraph ceased to have effect under clause (ii) of this subparagraph.

“(II) GRANT OF REQUEST.—The Attorney General shall grant a request submitted under subclause (I) within 60 days upon a showing of good cause.

“(E) DISPOSITION OF FUNDS HELD IN ABEYANCE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—If the chief executive officer of a State who has submitted an assurance under subparagraph (A)(ii)(II) subsequently submits a certification under subparagraph (A)(i) during the 3-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the Justice for All Reauthorization Act of 2016, the Attorney General will release all funds held in abeyance under subparagraph (A)(ii)(II) to be used by the State in accordance with the conditions of the grant program for which the funds were provided.

“(ii) RELEASE OF FUNDS.—If the chief executive officer of a State who has submitted an assurance under subparagraph (A)(ii)(II) is unable to submit a certification during the 3-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the Justice for All Reauthorization Act of 2016, but does assure the Attorney General that  $\frac{3}{4}$  of prisons under the operational control of the executive branch of the State have been audited at least once, the Attorney General shall release all of the funds of the State held in abeyance to be used in adopting and achieving full compliance with the national standards, if the State agrees to comply with the applicable requirements in clauses (ii) and (iii) of subparagraph (C).

“(iii) REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS.—If the chief executive officer of a State who has

submitted an assurance under subparagraph (A)(i)(II) is unable to submit a certification during the 3-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the Justice for All Reauthorization Act of 2016 and does not assure the Attorney General that % of prisons under the operational control of the executive branch of the State have been audited at least once, the Attorney General shall redistribute the funds of the State held in abeyance to other States to be used in accordance with the conditions of the grant program for which the funds were provided.

“(F) PUBLICATION OF AUDIT RESULTS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Justice for All Reauthorization Act of 2016, the Attorney General shall request from each State, and make available on an appropriate Internet website, all final audit reports completed to date for prisons under the operational control of the executive branch of each State. The Attorney General shall update such website annually with reports received from States under subparagraphs (B)(i) and (C)(i).

“(G) REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF NATIONAL STANDARDS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of the Justice for All Reauthorization Act of 2016, the Attorney General shall issue a report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives on the status of implementation of the national standards and the steps the Department, in conjunction with the States and other key stakeholders, is taking to address any unresolved implementation issues.”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(8) BACKGROUND CHECKS FOR AUDITORS.—An individual seeking certification by the Department of Justice to serve as an auditor of prison compliance with the national standards described in subsection (a) shall, upon request, submit fingerprints in the manner determined by the Attorney General for criminal history record checks of the applicable State and Federal Bureau of Investigation repositories.”.

#### SEC. 8. ADDITIONAL REAUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) DNA RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—Section 305(c) of the Justice for All Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 14136b(c)) is amended by striking “\$15,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2005 through 2009” and inserting “\$5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2017 through 2021”.

(b) FBI DNA PROGRAMS.—Section 307(a) of the Justice for All Act of 2004 (Public Law 108–405; 118 Stat. 2275) is amended by striking “\$42,100,000 for each of fiscal years 2005 through 2009” and inserting “\$7,400,000 for fiscal year 2017 and \$10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2018 through 2021”.

(c) DNA IDENTIFICATION OF MISSING PERSONS.—Section 308(c) of the Justice for All Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 14136d(c)) is amended by striking “fiscal years 2005 through 2009” and inserting “fiscal years 2017 through 2021”.

#### SEC. 9. PAUL COVERDELL FORENSIC SCIENCES IMPROVEMENT GRANTS.

(a) GRANTS.—Part BB of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797j) is amended—

(1) in section 2802(2) (42 U.S.C. 3797k(2)), by inserting after “bodies” the following: “and, except with regard to any medical examiner’s office, or coroner’s office in the State, is accredited by an accrediting body that is a signatory to an internationally recognized arrangement and that offers accreditation to forensic science conformity assessment bodies using an accreditation standard that is recognized by that internationally recognized arrangement, or attests, in a manner that is legally binding and enforceable, to use a portion of the grant amount to prepare and apply for such accreditation not more

than 2 years after the date on which a grant is awarded under section 2801”;

(2) in section 2803(a) (42 U.S.C. 3797l(a))—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “Seventy-five percent” and inserting “Eighty-five percent”; and

(ii) by striking “75 percent” and inserting “85 percent”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “Twenty-five percent” and inserting “Fifteen percent”;

(C) in paragraph (3), by striking “.06 percent” and inserting “.1 percent”;

(3) in section 2804(a) (42 U.S.C. 3797m(a))—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by inserting “impression evidence,” after “latent prints,”; and

(ii) by inserting “digital evidence, fire evidence,” after “toxicology,”;

(B) in paragraph (3), by inserting “and medicolegal death investigators” after “laboratory personnel”; and

(C) by inserting at the end the following:

“(4) To address emerging forensic science issues (such as statistics, contextual bias, and uncertainty of measurement) and emerging forensic science technology (such as high throughput automation, statistical software, and new types of instrumentation).

“(5) To educate and train forensic pathologists.

“(6) To fund medicolegal death investigation systems to facilitate accreditation of medical examiner and coroner offices and certification of medicolegal death investigators.”; and

(4) in section 2806(a) (42 U.S.C. 3797o(a))—

(A) in paragraph (3), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5); and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

“(4) the progress of any unaccredited forensic science service provider receiving grant funds toward obtaining accreditation; and”.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 1001(a)(24) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3793(a)(24)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (H), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (I), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(J) \$13,500,000 for fiscal year 2017;

“(K) \$18,500,000 for fiscal year 2018;

“(L) \$19,000,000 for fiscal year 2019;

“(M) \$21,000,000 for fiscal year 2020; and

“(N) \$23,000,000 for fiscal year 2021.”.

#### SEC. 10. IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF REPRESENTATION IN STATE CAPITAL CASES.

Section 426 of the Justice for All Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 14163e) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “\$75,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2005 through 2009” and inserting:

“(1) \$2,500,000 for fiscal year 2017;

“(2) \$7,500,000 for fiscal year 2018;

“(3) \$12,500,000 for fiscal year 2019;

“(4) \$17,500,000 for fiscal year 2020; and

“(5) \$22,500,000 for fiscal year 2021.”; and

(2) in subsection (b), by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, or upon a showing of good cause, and at the discretion of the Attorney General, the State may determine a fair allocation of funds across the uses described in sections 421 and 422”.

#### SEC. 11. POST-CONVICTION DNA TESTING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3600 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “under a sentence of” in each place it appears and inserting “sentenced to”; and

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(B)(i), by striking “death”; and

(B) in paragraph (3)(A), by striking “and the applicant did not—” and all that follows through “‘knowingly fail to request’” and inserting “and the applicant did not knowingly fail to request”;

(3) in subsection (b)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) order the Government to—

“(i) prepare an inventory of the evidence related to the case; and

“(ii) issue a copy of the inventory to the court, the applicant, and the Government.”;

(4) in subsection (e)—

(A) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

“(1) RESULTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The results of any DNA testing ordered under this section shall be simultaneously disclosed to the court, the applicant, and the Government.

“(B) RESULTS EXCLUDE APPLICANT.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—If a DNA profile is obtained through testing that excludes the applicant as the source and the DNA complies with the Federal Bureau of Investigation’s requirements for the uploading of crime scene profiles to the National DNA Index System (referred to in this subsection as ‘NDIS’), the court shall order that the law enforcement entity with direct or conveyed statutory jurisdiction that has access to the NDIS submit the DNA profile obtained from probative biological material from crime scene evidence to determine whether the DNA profile matches a profile of a known individual or a profile from an unsolved crime.

“(ii) NDIS SEARCH.—The results of a search under clause (i) shall be simultaneously disclosed to the court, the applicant, and the Government.”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “the National DNA Index System (referred to in this subsection as ‘NDIS’)” and inserting “NDIS”; and

(5) in subsection (g)(2)(B), by striking “death”.

(b) PRESERVATION OF BIOLOGICAL EVIDENCE.—Section 3600A of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “under a sentence of” and inserting “sentenced to”; and

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking paragraphs (1) and (2); and

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (3), (4), and (5) as paragraphs (1), (2), and (3), respectively.

#### SEC. 12. KIRK BLOODSWORTH POST-CONVICTION DNA TESTING PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 413 of the Justice for All Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 14136 note) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “fiscal years 2005 through 2009” and inserting “fiscal years 2017 through 2021”; and

(2) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) for eligible entities that are a State or unit of local government, provide a certification by the chief legal officer of the State in which the eligible entity operates or the chief legal officer of the jurisdiction in which the funds will be used for the purposes of the grants, that the State or jurisdiction—

“(A) provides DNA testing of specified evidence under a State statute or a State or local rule or regulation to persons sentenced to imprisonment or death for a State felony offense, in a manner intended to ensure a

reasonable process for resolving claims of actual innocence that ensures post-conviction DNA testing in at least those cases that would be covered by section 3600(a) of title 18, United States Code, had they been Federal cases and, if the results of the testing exclude the applicant as the source of the DNA, permits the applicant to apply for post-conviction relief, notwithstanding any provision of law that would otherwise bar the application as untimely; and

“(B) preserves biological evidence, as defined in section 3600A of title 18, United States Code, under a State statute or a State or local rule, regulation, or practice in a manner intended to ensure that reasonable measures are taken by the State or jurisdiction to preserve biological evidence secured in relation to the investigation or prosecution of, at a minimum, murder, nonnegligent manslaughter and sexual offenses.”

(b) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—Section 412(b) of the Justice for All Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 14136e(b)) is amended by striking “\$5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2005 through 2009” and inserting “\$10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2017 through 2021”.

### **SEC. 13. ESTABLISHMENT OF BEST PRACTICES FOR EVIDENCE RETENTION.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subtitle A of title IV of the Justice for All Act of 2004 (Public Law 108-405; 118 Stat. 2278) is amended by adding at the end the following:

#### **“SEC. 414. ESTABLISHMENT OF BEST PRACTICES FOR EVIDENCE RETENTION.**

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director of the National Institute of Justice, in consultation with Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies and government laboratories, shall—

“(1) establish best practices for evidence retention to focus on the preservation of forensic evidence; and

“(2) assist State, local, and tribal governments in adopting and implementing the best practices established under paragraph (1).

“(b) **DEADLINE.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Director of the National Institute of Justice shall publish the best practices established under subsection (a)(1).

“(c) **LIMITATION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to require or obligate compliance with the best practices established under subsection (a)(1).”

(b) **TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Justice for All Act of 2004 (Public Law 108-405; 118 Stat. 2260) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 413 the following:

“Sec. 414. Establishment of best practices for evidence retention.”

### **SEC. 14. EFFECTIVE ADMINISTRATION OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE.**

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “Effective Administration of Criminal Justice Act of 2016”.

(b) **STRATEGIC PLANNING.**—Section 502 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3752) is amended—

(1) by inserting “(A) **IN GENERAL.**—” before “To request a grant”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(6) A comprehensive Statewide plan detailing how grants received under this section will be used to improve the administration of the criminal justice system, which shall—

“(A) be designed in consultation with local governments, and representatives of all segments of the criminal justice system, including judges, prosecutors, law enforcement personnel, corrections personnel, and providers of indigent defense services, victim services,

juvenile justice delinquency prevention programs, community corrections, and reentry services;

“(B) include a description of how the State will allocate funding within and among each of the uses described in subparagraphs (A) through (G) of section 501(a)(1);

“(C) describe the process used by the State for gathering evidence-based data and developing and using evidence-based and evidence-gathering approaches in support of funding decisions;

“(D) describe the barriers at the State and local level for accessing data and implementing evidence-based approaches to preventing and reducing crime and recidivism; and

“(E) be updated every 5 years, with annual progress reports that—

“(i) address changing circumstances in the State, if any;

“(ii) describe how the State plans to adjust funding within and among each of the uses described in subparagraphs (A) through (G) of section 501(a)(1);

“(iii) provide an ongoing assessment of need;

“(iv) discuss the accomplishment of goals identified in any plan previously prepared under this paragraph; and

“(v) reflect how the plan influenced funding decisions in the previous year.

“(b) **TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.**—

“(1) **STRATEGIC PLANNING.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Attorney General shall begin to provide technical assistance to States and local governments requesting support to develop and implement the strategic plan required under subsection (a)(6). The Attorney General may enter into agreements with 1 or more non-governmental organizations to provide technical assistance and training under this paragraph.

“(2) **PROTECTION OF CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Attorney General shall begin to provide technical assistance to States and local governments, including any agent thereof with responsibility for administration of justice, requesting support to meet the obligations established by the Sixth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall include—

“(A) public dissemination of practices, structures, or models for the administration of justice consistent with the requirements of the Sixth Amendment; and

“(B) assistance with adopting and implementing a system for the administration of justice consistent with the requirements of the Sixth Amendment.

“(3) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—For each of fiscal years 2017 through 2021, of the amounts appropriated to carry out this subpart, not less than \$5,000,000 and not more than \$10,000,000 shall be used to carry out this subsection.”

(c) **APPLICABILITY.**—The requirement to submit a strategic plan under section 501(a)(6) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as added by subsection (b), shall apply to any application submitted under such section 501 for a grant for any fiscal year beginning after the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

### **SEC. 15. OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY.**

All grants awarded by the Department of Justice that are authorized under this Act shall be subject to the following:

(1) **AUDIT REQUIREMENT.**—Beginning in fiscal year 2016, and each fiscal year thereafter, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall conduct audits of recipients of grants under this Act to prevent waste,

fraud, and abuse of funds by grantees. The Inspector General shall determine the appropriate number of grantees to be audited each year.

(2) **MANDATORY EXCLUSION.**—A recipient of grant funds under this Act that is found to have an unresolved audit finding shall not be eligible to receive grant funds under this Act during the 2 fiscal years beginning after the 12-month period described in paragraph (5).

(3) **PRIORITY.**—In awarding grants under this Act, the Attorney General shall give priority to eligible entities that, during the 3 fiscal years before submitting an application for a grant under this Act, did not have an unresolved audit finding showing a violation in the terms or conditions of a Department of Justice grant program.

(4) **REIMBURSEMENT.**—If an entity is awarded grant funds under this Act during the 2-fiscal-year period in which the entity is barred from receiving grants under paragraph (2), the Attorney General shall—

(A) deposit an amount equal to the grant funds that were improperly awarded to the grantee into the General Fund of the Treasury; and

(B) seek to recoup the costs of the repayment to the fund from the grant recipient that was erroneously awarded grant funds.

(5) **DEFINED TERM.**—In this section, the term “unresolved audit finding” means an audit report finding in the final audit report of the Inspector General of the Department of Justice that the grantee has utilized grant funds for an unauthorized expenditure or otherwise unallowable cost that is not closed or resolved within a 12-month period beginning on the date when the final audit report is issued.

(6) **NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION REQUIREMENTS.**—

(A) **DEFINITION.**—For purposes of this section and the grant programs described in this Act, the term “nonprofit organization” means an organization that is described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and is exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code.

(B) **PROHIBITION.**—The Attorney General shall not award a grant under any grant program described in this Act to a nonprofit organization that holds money in offshore accounts for the purpose of avoiding paying the tax described in section 511(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(C) **DISCLOSURE.**—Each nonprofit organization that is awarded a grant under a grant program described in this Act and uses the procedures prescribed in regulations to create a rebuttable presumption of reasonableness for the compensation of its officers, directors, trustees and key employees, shall disclose to the Attorney General, in the application for the grant, the process for determining such compensation, including the independent persons involved in reviewing and approving such compensation, the comparability data used, and contemporaneous substantiation of the deliberation and decision. Upon request, the Attorney General shall make the information disclosed under this subsection available for public inspection.

(7) **ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.**—Unless otherwise explicitly provided in authorizing legislation, not more than 7.5 percent of the amounts authorized to be appropriated under this Act may be used by the Attorney General for salaries and administrative expenses of the Department of Justice.

(8) **CONFERENCE EXPENDITURES.**—

(A) **LIMITATION.**—No amounts authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Justice under this Act may be used by the Attorney General or by any individual or organization awarded discretionary funds through a cooperative agreement under this Act, to host or

support any expenditure for conferences that uses more than \$20,000 in Department funds, unless the Deputy Attorney General or the appropriate Assistant Attorney General, Director, or principal deputy as the Deputy Attorney General may designate, provides prior written authorization that the funds may be expended to host a conference.

(B) WRITTEN APPROVAL.—Written approval under subparagraph (A) shall include a written estimate of all costs associated with the conference, including the cost of all food and beverages, audio/visual equipment, honoraria for speakers, and any entertainment.

(C) REPORT.—The Deputy Attorney General shall submit an annual report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives on all conference expenditures approved by operation of this paragraph.

(9) PROHIBITION ON LOBBYING ACTIVITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Amounts authorized to be appropriated under this Act may not be utilized by any grant recipient to—

(i) lobby any representative of the Department of Justice regarding the award of grant funding; or

(ii) lobby any representative of a Federal, State, local, or tribal government regarding the award of grant funding.

(B) PENALTY.—If the Attorney General determines that any recipient of a grant under this Act has violated subparagraph (A), the Attorney General shall—

(i) require the grant recipient to repay the grant in full; and

(ii) prohibit the grant recipient from receiving another grant under this Act for not less than 5 years.

(10) PREVENTING DUPLICATIVE GRANTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Before the Attorney General awards a grant to an applicant under this Act, the Attorney General shall compare potential grant awards with other grants awarded under this Act to determine whether duplicate grants are awarded for the same purpose.

(B) REPORT.—If the Attorney General awards duplicate grants to the same applicant for the same purpose, the Attorney General shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report that includes—

(i) a list of all duplicate grants awarded, including the total dollar amount of any duplicate grants awarded; and

(ii) the reason the Attorney General awarded the duplicate grants.

#### SEC. 16. NEEDS ASSESSMENT OF FORENSIC LABORATORIES.

(a) STUDY AND REPORT.—Not later than October 1, 2018, the Attorney General shall conduct a study and submit a report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives on the status and needs of the forensic science community.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The report required under subsection (a) shall—

(1) examine the status of current workload, backlog, personnel, equipment, and equipment needs of public crime laboratories and medical examiner and coroner offices;

(2) include an overview of academic forensic science resources and needs, from a broad forensic science perspective, including non-traditional crime laboratory disciplines such as forensic anthropology, forensic entomology, and others as determined appropriate by the Attorney General;

(3) consider—

(A) the National Institute of Justice study, *Forensic Sciences: Review of Status and Needs*, published in 1999;

(B) the Bureau of Justice Statistics census reports on Publicly Funded Forensic Crime

Laboratories, published in 2002, 2005, 2009, and 2014;

(C) the National Academy of Sciences report, *Strengthening Forensic Science: A Path Forward*, published in 2009; and

(D) the Bureau of Justice Statistics survey of forensic providers recommended by the National Commission of Forensic Science and approved by the Attorney General on September 8, 2014;

(4) provide Congress with a comprehensive view of the infrastructure, equipment, and personnel needs of the broad forensic science community; and

(5) be made available to the public.

#### SEC. 17. CRIME VICTIM ASSISTANCE.

(a) AMENDMENT.—Section 1404(c)(1)(A) of the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10603(c)(1)(A)) is amended by inserting “victim services,” before “demonstration projects”.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the proposed rule entitled “VOCA Victim Assistance Program” published by the Office of Victims of Crime of the Department of Justice in the Federal Register on August 27, 2013 (78 Fed. Reg. 52877), is consistent with section 1404 of the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10603).

#### SEC. 18. IMPROVING THE RESTITUTION PROCESS.

Section 3612 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(j) EVALUATION OF OFFICES OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY AND DEPARTMENT COMPONENTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall, as part of the regular evaluation process, evaluate each office of the United States attorney and each component of the Department of Justice on the performance of the office or the component, as the case may be, in seeking and recovering restitution for victims under each provision of this title and the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 801 et seq.) that authorizes restitution.

“(2) REQUIREMENT.—Following an evaluation under paragraph (1), each office of the United States attorney and each component of the Department of Justice shall work to improve the practices of the office or component, as the case may be, with respect to seeking and recovering restitution for victims under each provision of this title and the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 801 et seq.) that authorizes restitution.

“(k) GAO REPORTS.—

“(1) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Comptroller General of the United States shall prepare and submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate a report on restitution sought by the Attorney General under each provision of this title and the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 801 et seq.) that authorizes restitution during the 3-year period preceding the report.

“(2) CONTENTS.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include statistically valid estimates of—

“(A) the number of cases in which a defendant was convicted and the Attorney General could seek restitution under this title or the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 801 et seq.);

“(B) the number of cases in which the Attorney General sought restitution;

“(C) of the cases in which the Attorney General sought restitution, the number of times restitution was ordered by the district courts of the United States;

“(D) the amount of restitution ordered by the district courts of the United States;

“(E) the amount of restitution collected pursuant to the restitution orders described in subparagraph (D);

“(F) the percentage of restitution orders for which the full amount of restitution has not been collected; and

“(G) any other measurement the Comptroller General determines would assist in evaluating how to improve the restitution process in Federal criminal cases.

“(3) RECOMMENDATIONS.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include recommendations on the best practices for—

“(A) requesting restitution in cases in which restitution may be sought under each provision of this title and the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 801 et seq.) that authorizes restitution;

“(B) obtaining restitution orders from the district courts of the United States; and

“(C) collecting restitution ordered by the district courts of the United States.

“(4) REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date on which the report required under paragraph (1) is submitted, the Comptroller General of the United States shall prepare and submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate a report on the implementation by the Attorney General of the best practices recommended under paragraph (3).”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on S. 2577, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

On October 30, 2004, President George W. Bush signed into law the Justice for All Act of 2004. The law contains four very important sections related to victims of crime and improving the criminal justice process. The law protects the rights of crime victims and eliminates the substantial backlog of DNA samples collected from both crime scenes and convicted offenders. It also improves and expands the DNA testing capacity of Federal, State, and local crime laboratories.

Finally, it establishes the rights of crime victims in Federal criminal proceedings and provides mechanisms for enforcing these rights.

The bill before us today, S. 2577, the Justice for All Reauthorization Act of 2016, is a bipartisan and bicameral bill that builds on the 2004 Justice for All Act. It further improves the criminal justice system and ensures public confidence in it. It strengthens crime victims' rights and programs by increasing access to restitution for Federal crime victims.

The act also further reduces the rape kit backlog and provides resources for

forensic labs while protecting the innocent by improving access to post-conviction DNA testing.

The Justice for All Act works to improve the administration of criminal justice programs by increasing accountability for Federal funds and requiring the Justice Department to assist State and local governments to improve their indigent defense systems. Additionally, it ensures the implementation of the Prison Rape Elimination Act.

I commend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for his hard work on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 2577, the Justice for All Reauthorization Act of 2016, and the complementary House bill that was authored by my good friend and colleague from Texas (Mr. POE), and my good friend and colleague from California (Mr. COSTA)—this is an important bill—and, of course, my Senator from the State of Texas, Senator CORNYN.

This bill now comes to the floor of the House as S. 2577. This bipartisan, bicameral legislation advances this Congress' efforts to enhance and improve our Nation's criminal justice system for victims, law enforcement, the courts, and innocent persons, while also fostering public trust and confidence in our criminal justice system.

It also reinforces the important work that the House Judiciary Committee has been doing under Chairman GOODLATTE and Ranking Member CONYERS. My greatest hope, as the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations, is that we can finish our work with the enormity of bills, sentencing reduction, prison reform, juvenile justice reform. I would like to optimistically think we might get these for the holiday season.

S. 2577 would reauthorize and improve upon various programs that began with the initial passage of the appropriately named Justice for All Act. I was proud to support this groundbreaking legislation in 2004, legislation intended to protect all persons who find themselves involved with the criminal justice system, and instill accountability throughout that system.

The programs we enacted in 2004 increased resources to boost the testing capabilities of forensic crime laboratories and eliminate the backlog of DNA samples from sexual assaults, crime scenes, and convicted offenders. I know this firsthand because Harris County—a very large county; fifth in the Nation—experienced this calamity, along with the city of Houston, the fact that these kits and other DNA evidence just couldn't seem to be tested expeditiously.

It also enhanced protections for victims of crimes, and established meas-

ures to prevent and overturn wrongful convictions.

The time has come to build upon the foundation we laid in 2004. Fairness and equal treatment under the law are two fundamental values of our Nation's system of justice. When the innocent are jailed for decades for crimes they did not commit, when victims watch their attackers go free because the physical evidence was misplaced or never tested, or when overworked forensic lab technicians provide false reports, the people's trust and belief in the system is diminished.

The bill we are considering today would strengthen crime victims' rights, programs, and services. In addition, it would further reduce the rape kit backlog, provide additional resources to forensic labs, improve access to post-conviction DNA testing, ensure implementation of the Prison Rape Elimination Act, and improve the overall administration of criminal justice systems nationwide, including increasing accountability, transparency, effectiveness and fiscal efficiency.

I hate having to give anecdotal stories, but, unfortunately, again, in Harris County, thousands of pieces of evidence were lost when they were in the possession of one of our local law enforcement structures. We have a lot of law enforcement layers. This happened to be a constable's office.

Mr. Speaker, you know how damaging and dangerous that is to victims' rights, to criminal justice, to the Constitution. That is why this bill is so very important. Being the victim of a crime is a harrowing, disorienting experience. We must do our best to erase or ease the suffering of victims and assist them as they work to rebuild their lives.

Under S. 2577, housing rights for victims of domestic violence would be expanded, and Violence Against Women Act funding would be protected from reductions due to Federal penalties. Other victim-centered programs would be reauthorized by this bill, including programs used to notify victims of their right to be heard in court, to offer victims legal assistance, and to provide interpreters for Federal crime victims who wish to participate in court proceedings.

Additionally, the Government Accountability Office will be required to determine the potential benefits to crime victims, if any, by broadening the authority of Federal courts to award restitution. Our crime victims need relief. We need to give them hope and a sense that we care about them.

The Attorney General will be required to evaluate the effectiveness of the Justice Department components and U.S. Attorney Offices in pursuing and obtaining restitution for crime victims. We all know DNA is a crucial element of many criminal cases, helping to identify suspects, perpetrators of crimes, and to exclude the innocent.

This bill would ensure that victims of sexual assault receive essential serv-

ices and are able to see their attackers brought to justice by renewing the DNA Backlog grant program and by expanding grants for forensic nurse examiners, giving priority to hiring full-time forensic nurses, establishing programs in rural and underserved areas, and training forensic nurses.

□ 1545

Agencies across the country would realize further reductions in their rape kit backlogs because the Justice Department would be required, under this legislation, to use at least 75 percent of the funds made available for forensic testing for direct testing of crime scene evidence, including rape kits.

Under this measure, Debbie Smith grant recipients would have to report on the achievement of activities conducted using grant funds. S. 2577 would require the Attorney General to report annually to Congress on how Debbie Smith grant funds are being used to improve DNA testing and reduce the backlogs.

I know that my good friend CAROLYN MALONEY has been involved in these issues as well.

S. 2577 would reauthorize funding for several other DNA grant programs, including the Paul Coverdell Forensic Science Improvement Grant Program, which helps States and local governments that need it greatly speak to the loss of thousands of pieces of evidence in a local law enforcement office.

In that same vein, the Attorney General would be required to conduct a needs assessment for State and local forensic science labs to better utilize Federal funding.

This bill would also enhance protections for the innocent by improving access to postconviction DNA testing, encouraging States to test DNA evidence in criminal cases for which there is untested DNA evidence, expanding State access to postconviction DNA testing funds by narrowing the evidence preservation requirement, and authorizing Federal postconviction DNA testing for individuals who can show exculpatory DNA evidence exists in their case despite having pled guilty.

We have a responsibility to make this criminal justice system fit in the four corners of the Constitution. That includes due process as one of the elements and certainly the response and caring of those individuals who have been victims. We have a responsibility to ensure the safe and humane treatment of individuals, even if they are convicted of crimes and in prison.

Compliance with the Prison Rape Elimination Act would be an all-but-certain result of the incentive structure set in S. 2577, which would require State and local governments to focus more resources on implementation of this legislation's directives, which we really need, while allowing the flexibility necessary to reach full compliance. For example, States that receive Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grants would be required to



develop a strategic plan setting out how the grant money will be used.

Finally, this bill includes various provisions to ensure Federal funds are used efficiently and effectively.

I believe that this bill answers our concerns on the question of criminal justice reform and constitutional protection for all.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 2577, the "Justice for All Reauthorization Act of 2016," as amended.

This bipartisan, bicameral legislation advances this Congress's efforts to enhance and improve our Nation's criminal justice system for victims, law enforcement, the courts, and innocent persons, while also fostering public trust and confidence in our criminal justice system.

S. 2577 would reauthorize and improve upon various programs that began with the initial passage of the appropriately-named Justice for All Act.

I was proud to support this groundbreaking legislation in 2004—legislation intended to protect all persons who find themselves involved with the criminal justice system and instill accountability throughout that system.

The programs we enacted in 2004 increased resources to boost the testing capabilities of forensic crime laboratories and eliminate the backlog of DNA samples from sexual assaults, crime scenes, and convicted offenders.

It also enhanced protections for victims of crimes and established measures to prevent and overturn wrongful convictions.

The time has come to build upon the foundation we laid in 2004.

Fairness and equal treatment under the law are two fundamental values of our Nation's system of justice. When the innocent are jailed for decades for crimes they did not commit, when victims watch their attackers go free because the physical evidence was misplaced or never tested, or when overworked forensic lab technicians provide false reports, the people's trust and belief in the system is diminished.

The bill we are considering today would strengthen crime victims' rights, programs, and services.

In addition, it would—  
further reduce the rape kit backlog;  
provide additional resources to forensic labs;  
improve access to post-conviction DNA testing;

ensure implementation of the Prison Rape Elimination Act; and

improve the overall administration of criminal justice systems nationwide by increasing accountability, transparency, effectiveness, and fiscal efficiency.

Being the victim of a crime is a harrowing, disorienting experience. We must do our best to ease the suffering of victims and assist them as they work to rebuild their lives.

Under S. 2577, housing rights for victims of domestic violence would be expanded and Violence Against Women Act funding would be protected from reductions due to federal penalties.

Other victim-centered programs would be reauthorized by this bill, including programs used to notify victims of their right to be heard

in court, to offer victims legal assistance, and to provide interpreters for federal crime victims who wish to participate in court proceedings.

Additionally, the Government Accountability Office would be required to determine the potential benefits to crime victims, if any, by broadening the authority of federal courts to award restitution.

And, the Attorney General would be required to evaluate the effectiveness of Justice Department components and U.S. Attorney Offices in pursuing and obtaining restitution for crime victims.

We all know DNA is a crucial element of many criminal cases, helping to identify suspects and perpetrators of crimes and exclude the innocent.

This bill would ensure that victims of sexual assault receive essential services and are able to see their attackers brought to justice by renewing the DNA Backlog Grant Program and expanding grants for forensic nurse examiners, giving priority to hiring full-time forensic nurses, establishing programs in rural and underserved areas, and training forensic nurses.

Agencies across the country would realize further reductions in their rape kit backlogs because the Justice Department would be required under this legislation to use at least 75 percent of funds made available for forensic testing for direct testing of crime scene evidence, including rape kits.

Under this measure, Debbie Smith Grant recipients would have to report on the achievement of activities conducted using grant funds. S. 2577 would require the Attorney General to report annually to Congress on how Debbie Smith Grant funds are being used to improve DNA testing and reduce the backlogs.

Further, S. 2577 would reauthorize funding for several other DNA grant programs, including the Paul Coverdell Forensic Sciences Improvement Grant Program, which helps states and local governments improve the quality of forensic science services provided.

In that same vein, the Attorney General would be required to conduct a needs assessment for state and local forensic science labs to better utilize federal funding.

This bill would also enhance protections for the innocent by—

improving access to post-conviction DNA testing;

encouraging states to test DNA evidence in criminal cases for which there is untested DNA evidence;

expanding state access to post-conviction DNA testing funds by narrowing the evidence preservation requirement; and

authorizing federal post-conviction DNA testing for individuals who can show exculpatory DNA evidence exists in their case despite having pled guilty.

We have a responsibility to ensure the safe and humane treatment of individuals even if they are convicted of crimes and sentenced to prison.

Compliance with the Prison Rape Elimination Act would be an all but certain result of the incentive structure set forth in S. 2577, which would require state and local governments to focus more resources on implementation of this legislation's directives, while allowing the flexibility necessary to reach full compliance.

For example, states that receive Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant grants would be required to develop a stra-

tegic plan setting out how the grant money will be used to improve their criminal systems.

Finally, this bill includes various provisions to ensure federal funds are used efficiently and effectively.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important legislation and I reserve the balance of my time.

The Justice for All Reauthorization Act is supported by a broad spectrum of organizations involved in, or affected by, our criminal justice system.

These organizations include—  
the National Sheriffs Association and the National District Attorneys Association;  
the Council of State Governments;  
the U.S. Conference of Mayors;  
the National Center for Victims of Crime;  
the Washington Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights;  
the Human Rights Campaign; and  
the Innocence Project.

In closing, I want to commend my colleagues in the House, including Judiciary Committee Chairman BOB GOODLATTE, Crime Subcommittee Chairman JIM SENSENBRENNER, and Congressman TED POE, sponsor of the House companion.

And, I also want to acknowledge Senator PATRICK LEAHY for his authorship of the underlying statute and for his leadership in the reauthorization of these critical programs.

For the foregoing reasons, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for this legislation today.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA), who is an original cosponsor of this legislation.

Mr. COSTA. I thank the gentlewoman from Texas for yielding 2 minutes, and I want to thank her and the chairman, the gentleman from Virginia, for their hard work on this very important piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, as the lead Democratic cosponsor of the Justice for All Reauthorization Act and the co-chair of the Congressional Victims' Rights Caucus, along with my good friend and colleague Congressman TED POE, who I know wanted to be here and who has worked so hard on this legislation, we as the chairs of the bipartisan Congressional Victims' Rights Caucus want those groups out there throughout the country to understand how important this legislation is. The broad coalition of groups that are supporting this and the bipartisan group of lawmakers who worked tirelessly to get this legislation on the House floor today is making a difference.

The Justice for All Reauthorization Act will improve our criminal justice system, and it will strengthen programs for victims of crimes. The healing process for the survivors of violent crime, as we all know, can be extremely painful and it can be difficult.

This legislation also helps those survivors by providing resources to reduce, as has been noted already, the

rape kit backlog. It also improves housing rights for domestic violence victims. We have these centers in our congressional districts that many of us are familiar with where spouses and children go to escape violence. It also assists with hiring full-time sexual assault nurse examiners in every hospital throughout the country.

Additionally, this bill ensures that the guilty are punished and helps to protect the wrongfully convicted by improving access to postconviction DNA testing. One thing we have learned for certain over the last decade is that, in law enforcement, DNA testing has become an important tool to apprehend and to prove guilt where, in fact, we did not have that tool before.

These strengthened policies will better provide support for victims of crime throughout the country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. COSTA. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, these policies will provide better support for victims of crime throughout the country, especially those who live in rural regions, and we have many rural regions throughout the country. I represent one of those areas in California, the San Joaquin Valley.

I urge my colleagues in the House to support this bill, and I hope the Senate acts swiftly before the end of the year so this Justice for All Reauthorization Act is enacted before Congress adjourns.

Let us remember, Mr. Speaker, that these victims of crimes are members of our families; they are our neighbors; they are people who we know in our communities and in our congressional districts. We know who they are, and we know that these are innocent victims of crime. This legislation goes a long way to address their issues. I urge the support of my colleagues.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I will close my remarks by thanking Mr. COSTA for his leadership. We know that our good friend Congressman TED POE wanted to be here. We thank him for his leadership and the many Members who engaged in this important legislation.

The Justice for All Reauthorization Act is supported by a broad spectrum of organizations involved in or affected by our criminal justice system. Let me share a few: the National Sheriffs' Association, the National District Attorneys Association, the Council of State Governments, the United States Conference of Mayors, the National Center for Victims of Crime, the Washington Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights, the Human Rights Campaign, and the Innocence Project.

In closing, I would like to commend my colleagues in the House, including Judiciary Committee Chairman BOB GOODLATTE; Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations Subcommittee Chairman SENSENBRENNER; and Congressman TED POE, the sponsor of the House companion; and the work that we have done on the Judiciary Committee, as I started out my remarks, in dealing with the enormity of sentencing, passing legislation that will reduce the impact of mandatory minimums, prison reform that we have passed, and certainly looking to reform juvenile justice.

I, too, hope that the legislation that we are speaking of will move and be passed before this session of Congress ends. I would like to think optimistically that we may get some very important bills that we have dealt with in the Judiciary Committee passed as well.

I also want to acknowledge Senator PATRICK LEAHY for his authorship of the underlying statute and for his leadership of the reauthorization of these critical programs, and as I indicated, my senior Senator, JOHN CORNYN, of Texas.

I want to conclude by saying that I left Texas in the backdrop of a Federal court hearing that dealt with the broken bail system, another aspect of criminal justice reform, where 40 percent of individuals on misdemeanors who cannot pay \$150 or cannot pay \$100 remain incarcerated. What we are doing today is we are joining in a bipartisan manner to begin to approach some of those inequities by this legislation, and I know that we can move forward on many others. So I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for this legislation today, which is an important bill, S. 2577, and the House companion.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for his hard work and his leadership on this issue, and I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA) as well.

This is a very good bill, and I urge my colleagues to vote for the Justice for All Reauthorization Act of 2016.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today, I urge the House to pass the Justice for All Reauthorization Act to improve crime victims access to justice, support law enforcement, exonerate the innocent, and strengthen and improve our criminal justice system. In the House, I would like to thank Representative JIM COSTA for joining me in introducing this important legislation. I would also like to thank Senator JOHN CORNYN and Senator PATRICK LEAHY for sponsoring this bill in the Senate.

The Justice for All Act of 2004 enhanced protection for crime victims, provided resources to expand the use of DNA and forensic technology to capture and convict criminals, and established safeguards to reverse wrongful convictions.

This legislation reauthorizes these important programs and also increases crime victims access to restitution and improves housing protections for domestic violence victims. Under this legislation, states will be encouraged to test unexamined DNA evidence in criminal cases to ensure that innocent people are not imprisoned for crimes they did not commit. But one of the most important things this law will do is tackle the national rape kit backlog by providing critically important resources to forensic labs. A victim of rape is sentenced to a lifetime of mental turmoil, but as rape victim Debbie Smith can attest, also knowing that your attacker is still on the streets is far worse.

Debbie was at home doing laundry one afternoon in Williamsburg, Virginia. Suddenly, a masked intruder walked through her backdoor and dragged her outside into a wooded area where he raped her repeatedly. Her attacker told her that if she called the police, he would return to her house and kill her. She was lucky to escape with her life. It was only after her husband begged her to contact the police that she agreed to take a forensic exam. Even though the police had a DNA sample, they didn't test her rape kit. Debbie was left in fear that her rapist would return to her home and kill her for reporting her rape. Finally, after six and a half years, the police tested Debbie's kit and put her attacker behind bars. Debbie has since become a fierce advocate for the elimination of the rape kit testing backlog that occurs all across the nation, and she has been a loud supporter of the Justice for All Reauthorization Act's provisions to address this issue.

As Debbie has said, I know that DNA testing gave me peace, and I want to make sure that other victims have that same opportunity. The Justice for All Reauthorization Act of 2016 is supported by over a thousand victim advocacy groups from around the country. I urge my colleagues to vote to pass this important, bipartisan piece of legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 2577, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### FUNDING FOR THE NATIONAL HUMAN TRAFFICKING HOTLINE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5422) to ensure funding for the National Human Trafficking Hotline, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5422

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. FUNDING FOR THE NATIONAL HUMAN TRAFFICKING HOTLINE; PERFECTING AMENDMENT.

(a) HHS FUNDING FOR TRAFFICKING HOTLINE.—Section 107(b)(1)(B)(ii) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22